UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,478	06/21/2007	Peter Siig	900.46373X00	9714
20457 7590 06/19/2008 ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET			EXAMINER	
			HURLEY, SHAUN R	
	SUITE 1800 ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ŕ			3765	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/590,478	SIIG, PETER		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Shaun R. Hurley	3765		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 Au</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 9-26 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 9-26 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access that any objection to the construction and policion and policion to the construction and policion to the construction and policion and	r election requirement. r. epted or b)⊡ objected to by the B drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08/24/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte		

Art Unit: 3765

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because figure 3 is illegible. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure, with particular attention paid to the bolded section below.

The abstract should be in narrative form and <u>generally limited to a single paragraph</u> on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

Art Unit: 3765

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 9-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedegaard (6701756) in view of Mustacich et al (6490852).

Hedegaard teaches a method for securing a fur on a pelting board which is temporarily fastened in a pelting board holder, wherein the fur is stretched on the pelting board to a desired length and fixed thereto without damaging the fur (Abstract; Figure 4). While Hedegaard essentially teaches the invention as detailed, he fails to specifically teach wrapping an elastic (inherent of the material taught) band around the central material via a displaceable winding unit having a stoppable supply reel and movable around the central material on a guide ring, which Mustacich teaches (Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have utilized such a winding mechanism, so as to temporarily fasten a material in a known manner. Hedegaard teaches using a sleeve to hold the fur in place without damage, but the ordinarily skilled artisan would have understood that any manner of product could be used that would create a pressure on the outside of fur against the pelting board to temporarily fasten them, including wrapping a length of elastic material.

Mustacich teaches us that such mechanisms to wrap elastic material are already known and

Art Unit: 3765

understood, and the ordinarily skilled artisan would have found it obvious to try combining the two, so as to create a temporary fastening means for the fur to the pelt. In regards to the band locking to itself, knot tying is well known and well within the ordinarily skilled artisan's abilities.

Conclusion

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hedegaard (20030019255), Phillbrick (2232885), Black et al (5564293), Jonas (2942448), Goekler et al (4461429), Ferree (4346550), and British Patent (2211203) all teach what is well known in the art.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shaun R. Hurley whose telephone number is (571) 272-4986. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon Fri, 8:00 am 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Welch can be reached on (571) 272-4996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3765

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shaun R Hurley Primary Examiner Art Unit 3765

SRH 10 June 2008

/Shaun R Hurley/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3765